REMARKS

In the Office Action of April 25, 2008, the Examiner: (1) rejected claims 1-2, 13-14 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,029,000 ("Woolsey"); (2) rejected claims 3-5, 15 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Woolsey in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,210,828 ("Bolan"); and (3) rejected claims 6-12, 16-19 and 23-26 as allegedly obvious over Woolsey in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/00624427 ("Chauvel").

With this response, Applicants amend claim 1. Applicants believe the pending claims are allowable and respectfully request reconsideration.

I. ART BASED REJECTIONS

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 is rejected as allegedly anticipated by Woolsey. Applicant amends claim 1 to more clearly define over Woolsey's teaching of executing plurality of operating systems in a multi-processor system.

Woolsey is directed to a mobile communication system with cross compiler and cross linker. (Woolsey Title). In particular, Woolsey teaches a wireless data platform comprising a host processor and one or more DSPs or other coprocessors. (Woolsey Col. 2, lines 33-36). Woolsey teaches that the host processor utilizes a host real time operating system. (Woolsey Col. 3, lines 36-38). Further, Woolsey teaches that the DSP or other coprocessor utilizes a DSP real time operating system. (Woolsey Col. 3, lines 52-53). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Woolsey teaches a multi-processor where each of the processors execute an operating system.

Claim 1, by contrast, specifically recites "a first processor; a second processor coupled to the first processor, and only the first processor configured to execute a single operating system." Applicants submit that Woolsey does not expressly or inherently teach such a system. In particular, Woolsey teaches that the host processor executes a host operating system and the DSP (or other coprocessor) executes a DSP operating system. Thus, Applicants submit that Woolsey teaches at least two operating systems executing in the multi-processor system and fails to expressly or inherently teach "a first

processor; a second processor coupled to the first processor, and **only the first processor configured to execute a single operating system**."

Based at least on the foregoing Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over Woolsey, and all claims which depend on claim 1 (claims 2-12) should be allowed.

B. Claim 13

Claim 13 is rejected as allegedly anticipated by Woolsey.

Claim 13 specifically recites "executing a single operating system in the multi-processor system, the single operating system executing on only one of a plurality of processors." Applicants submit that Woolsey does not expressly or inherently teach such a method. In particular, Woolsey teaches that the host processor executes a host operating system and the DSP (or other coprocessor) executes a DSP operating system. Thus, Applicants submit that Woolsey teaches at least two operating systems executing in the multi-processor system and fails to expressly or inherently teach "**executing a single operating system in the multi-processor system, the single operating system executing on only one of a plurality of processors**."

Based at least on the foregoing Applicant submits that claim 13 is allowable over Woolsey, and all claims which depend on claim 13 (claims 14-19) should be allowed.

C. Claim 20

Claim 20 is rejected as allegedly anticipated by Woolsey.

Claim 20 specifically recites "a computer-readable medium storing a program that, when executed by a multi-processor system, causes only one of a plurality of processors to execute a single operating system in the multi-processor system." Applicants submit that Woolsey does not expressly or inherently teach such a computer-readable medium. In particular, Woolsey teaches that the host processor executes a host operating system and the DSP (or other coprocessor) executes a DSP operating system. Thus, Applicants submit that Woolsey teaches at least two operating systems executing in the multi-processor system and fails to expressly or inherently teach "a computer-readable medium storing a program that, when executed by a multi-processor system, causes only one of a plurality of processors to **execute a single operating system in the multi-processor system**."

Based at least on the foregoing Applicant submits that claim 20 is allowable over Woolsey, and all claims which depend on claim 20 (claims 21-26) should be allowed.

II. CONCLUSION

In course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite the resolution of this case, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to the Texas Instruments, Inc. Deposit Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

/Utpal D. Shah/

Utpal D. Shah
PTO Reg. No. 60,047
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(512) 610-3410 (Phone)
(512) 610-3456 (Fax)
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS